



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/309,161	05/10/1999	LAWRENCE CUI	OLAL1006.002	7164

23910 7590 09/25/2002

FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY, LLP  
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER  
SUITE 400  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/309,161

Applicant(s)

CUI ET AL.

Examiner

CESAR B PAULA

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 May 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the application filed on 5/10/99.

**This action is made Non-Final.**

2. Claim 1 is pending in the case. Claim 1 is an independent claim.

#### *Claim Objections*

3. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: "striping off any cookies" in line 4. It seems the Applicants were referring to *stripping off any cookies*. Appropriate correction is required.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the response header" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. There is no response header previously recited in the claim.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2176

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quinlan et al, hereinafter Quinlan (Pat. # 6,397,253 B1, 5/28/02, filed on 10/6/98), in view of Wagner (Pat. # 6,085,224, 7/4/00, filed on 3/11/97), and further in view of McGee (Pat. # 6,393,468 B1, 5/21/02, filed on 3/13/98).

Regarding independent claim 1, Quinlan discloses managing cookies by avoiding unnecessary detection of cookies, and by coding session information into URL(s) (c.7,L.26-44).

Moreover, Quinlan discloses creating and specifying a new session id—URL—as a result of a browser request (c.6, L.27-67).

Moreover, Moreover, Quinlan discloses detecting cookies in the header of the response web page (c.7, L.27-67). Quinlan fails to explicitly teach *stripping off any cookies set by an external web site from the response header of the response web page*. However, Wagner discloses the deletion of cookies from web page headers (c.3,L.1-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stripped the cookies, because Wagner teaches above, the removal of unwanted cookies without modifying the browser code.

Furthermore, Quinlan discloses detecting cookies in the header of the response web page (c.7, L.27-67). Quinlan fails to explicitly teach *appending the session id to all of the links embedded in the response page and sending the modified response page, with the new header*. However, Wagner discloses the deletion of cookies from web page headers, and sending the

modified web page to a user (c.2,L.54-c.3,L.67). McGee discloses the appending of session id to all the URLs embedded in a web pages (c.10,L.34-67, c.11,L.56-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stripped the cookies, and appended sent the web page to the requesting user, because Wagner teaches above, the removal of unwanted cookies without modifying the browser code, and McGee discloses assure that only authorized users can access web pages (c.4,L.43-67).

### ***Conclusion***

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Endo et al. (Pat. # 5,801,713), Wright (Pat. # 5,704,029), Skopp et al. (Pat. # 6,256,739), and Durham (Pat. # 6,330,566).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Director United States Patent and Trademark Office

Art Unit: 2176

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

- (703) 746-7238, (for **After Final** communications intended for entry)
- (703) 746-7239, (for **Formal** communications intended for entry, **except formal After Final communications**)


Or:

- (703) 746-7240, (for **Informal or Draft** communications for discussion only, please label  
“**PROPOSED**” or “**DRAFT**”).

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).**

*CBP*

9/17/02

  
**STEPHEN S. HONG**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**